

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

RICHARD FELTZ, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TULSA COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 18-cv-298-CVE-JFJ

**NON-PARTY JARI ASKINS/ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURT’S
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE**

Non-Party Jari Askins/Administrative Office of the Courts (“AOC”), by and through the undersigned counsel, respectfully applies for an additional thirty (30) days within which to comply with Plaintiff’s Subpoena *Duces Tecum*. [Doc. 210-1]. In support, AOC states:

1. AOC was served with Plaintiff’s Subpoena *Duces Tecum* on October 9, 2020. OAC then filed a Motion to Quash Plaintiff’s subpoena in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma on November 23, 2020. *Feltz v. Tulsa County et al.*, 20-MC-12 (Western District of Okla.).

2. On November 25, 2020, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Compel Compliance in this Court. [Doc. 210]. On December 9, 2020, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Dismiss and Transfer AOC’s Motion to Quash in the Western District case.

3. On December 11, 2020, AOC filed a Motion to Stay with this Court pending the ruling in of the Western District on AOC’s motion to quash. [Doc. 216]. This Court granted AOC’s motion on December 16, 2020. [Doc. 219].

4. The Western District denied AOC's Motion to Quash on December 18, 2020, after the matter had been fully briefed. As such, this Court directed AOC to respond to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel on December 31, 2020. [Doc. 232]. AOC filed a response to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel on December 31, 2020. [Doc. 234].

5. On March 25, 2021, this Court entered an order setting a telephonic hearing to issue its ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel. [Doc. 266]. On March 26, 2021, this Court issued its order granting in part, and denying in part, Plaintiff's motion to compel. The Court directed AOC to comply with portions of Plaintiff's subpoena on or before April 16, 2021. [Doc. 267].

6. This requested extension is not made for the purpose of delay.

7. AOC is in need of additional time to extract, prepare, review, and produce the requested documents, as the request is voluminous.

8. In all of its history, AOC has never produced a bulk distribution of such documents or materials prior to this Court's ruling.

9. The undersigned has communicated with counsel for Plaintiff about this motion. Plaintiff's counsel indicates she has no objection to the requested extension.

WHEREFORE, Non-Party Administrative Office of the Court respectfully requests an additional thirty (30) days, to provide the documents requested in Plaintiff's subpoena.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeb Joseph

JEB JOSEPH, OBA # 19137

Assistant Attorney General

Oklahoma Attorney General's Office

Litigation Division

313 N. E. 21st Street

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Telephone: (405) 521-3921

Facsimile: (405) 521-4518

Email: Jeb.Joseph@oag.ok.gov

*Attorney for Non-Party, Jari Askins/Administrative
Office of the Courts*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 15th day of April 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via the Court's ECF system to all registered counsel for the litigants herein.

/s/ Jeb Joseph

Jeb Joseph